

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 24 2007

Attorney's Docket: 2003DE134  
Serial No.: 10/577,590  
Group: 1755

#### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 23, 2007, has been carefully considered. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. The amendments made herein are fully supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this Application. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Therefore, the claims under consideration are believed to include claims 1-7 and 9-13.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office finds claims 1-13 Indefinite for a variety of reasons.

In claim 1, the Office finds improper Markush language and suggests that the term "or" be changed to the term "and". Such amendment has been made.

In claims 4, 5 and 12, the Office finds part d) unclear as to what is meant by the phrase "additives customary in master batch production." By this Amendment, such claims has been amended to read as follows:

at least one additive selected from the group consisting of UV absorbers, antioxidants, optical brighteners, fillers, antistats, lubricants and dispersing assistants.

In claim 4, 5 and 12, the Office finds in part e) the phrase "the fractions" as lacking antecedent basis. Such phrase has been deleted and replaced by the phrase "wherein the weight percentages of..."

Attorney's Docket: 2003DE134  
Serial No.: 10/577,590  
Group: 1755

Also in claims 4, 5 and 12, in part f, the Office states that the phrase "the sum total" lacks proper antecedent basis. By this Amendment, such phrase has been amended to read as follows, "based on the sum of the weight percentages of the components A and B ..."

In claim 7, the Office alleges the term "macromolecular" to be a relative term. Additionally, in claim 8, the Office finds the phrase "The macromolecular organic material" lacks proper antecedent basis. Applicants have cancelled claim 8 and imported the subject matter thereof into claim 7 to thereby define what is meant by a macromolecular organic material.

In claim 8, the Office states that it is unclear as to the types of material encompassed by the term "electric." Such term has been replaced by "electronic inks and electronic papers." As claim 8 has been cancelled, such corrective phrase is found in amended claim 7.

The Office finds that in claim 9, the phrase low-warpage is a relative phrase which renders the claim indefinite. Such phrase has been deleted from claims 9 and 10.

In claim 10, the Office is of the position that the phrase "at least one polyolefin" makes no sense. Applicants respectfully disagrees. Applicants are merely stating that the partly crystalline plastic could be made of more than one polyolefin. For that reason, it is respectfully contended that the claim exhibits the necessary clarity required under § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully contended that the § 112, second paragraph rejections have been overcome, and, with respect to claim 10, traversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 24 2007

Attorney's Docket: 2003DE134  
Serial No.: 10/577,590  
Group: 1755

Claim Objections

The Office objects to claims 1 and 9 for informalities.


In claim 1 the Office urges Applicants to insert some punctuation between the phrase "Blue 15:3" and "C.I. Pigment Blue 15:1". Applicants have amended the claim to place a comma after the phrase "Blue 15:3".

In claim 9, Applicants inadvertently spelled "the" incorrectly, which has been corrected by this Amendment.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully contended that the claims objections have been overcome. Therefore Applicants courteously solicit withdrawal of the objections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the present Application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of it is requested. If the Examiner disagrees, he is requested to contact the attorney for Applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Anthony A. Bisulca  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,913

**(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)**

Clariant Corporation  
Industrial Property Department  
4000 Monroe Road  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28205  
Phone: (704) 331-7151  
Fax: (704) 331-7707